



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

and a follower of Posidonius would, I believe, in Vergil's day have qualified pretty well for membership in the Stoic household of faith.

—But, Book 6 is, for Professor Frank, a mere *mythos* like Plato's *mythos* of Er. The Epicureans, he says, allowed their poets much freedom in the use of heterodox material (125), as we may learn from Lucretius (2.655). But the purely figurative use there sanctioned and the largely decorative lines of Lucr. 5.737 are far removed from the serious character of Aeneid 6. Nor is it quite correct to speak (126) of the "blunt statement of Servius (on VI, 893) that the portal of unreal dreams refers the imagery of the sixth book to fiction", for Servius's note gives several confused and inconsistent suggestions. I believe, with Norden<sup>18</sup>, that the correct explanation of the ivory gate is that given by the late William Everett<sup>19</sup>, and that its significance is primarily temporal, indicating that Aeneas left the underworld before midnight<sup>20</sup>. Though there is doubtless much, then, in Book 6 which is not to be taken as the exact and dogmatic belief of Vergil (as the eschatology of Plato's *Phaedo* was not considered by its author as precise and definite), yet we are unjustified in explaining the whole book away as a mere fiction of the literary imagination.

Professor Frank says little or nothing of the character of Aeneas. It is a large subject and need not here be discussed save to say that perhaps nowhere in Roman imaginative literature have we a better incarnation of the Stoic ideal, in which both the virtues and the defects of that conception are fully illustrated. This is to be seen at every turn, but particularly in Book 4. The mere mention of a few phrases is enough: ille Iovis monitis immota tenebat lumina et obnixus curam sub corde premebat (331-332); me si fata meis paterentur ducere vitam auspiciis et sponte mea componere curas, etc. (340-341); Italiam non sponte sequor (361); tunditur et magno persentit pectore curas; mens immota manet, lacrimae volvantur inanes (448-449)<sup>21</sup>. It would be tempting to contrast Dido with Aeneas and to find in her the embodiment of Epicurean ideals, but I do not desire at this time to press this point.

Vergil deliberately selected, then, in the composition of the Aeneid, a theme inseparably entangled with the idea of a purposeful, divinely appointed destiny, and depicted his hero as a typical Stoic might well have been shown. That one who was an Epicurean at heart might have selected such a theme and so treated it is, of course, a physical possibility, just as it is possible that a Unitarian might choose as the subject of a great poem the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, but the opposite probabilities are so overwhelming that an uncommon burden of proof rests

upon him who would reverse the accepted interpretation.

Other Romans had been Epicureans and had later rejected the faith—witness the case of Cicero<sup>22</sup>—, and if we read the philosophical works of Cicero we may get some idea of why they did so. What Vergil's motives for the change were we may only infer. The part, however, which he seems to have played in the religious restoration under Augustus agrees more exactly with the figure of a Stoic than with that of an Epicurean<sup>23</sup>. Donatus remarks (*Vita*, 35): anno aetatis quinquagesimo secundo inpositurus Aeneidi summam manum statuit in Graeciam et in Asiam secedere triennioque continuo nihil amplius quam emendare, ut reliqua vita tantum philosophiae vacaret. What philosophy? A return to the villula Sironis, Professor Frank would probably say. But may we not more probably conjecture that it was to a further study of Stoicism, perhaps in the endeavor to work out more completely the problems of fate and eschatology which are, after all, so roughly sketched in the Aeneid?

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE

## REVIEW

Solon the Athenian. By Ivan M. Linforth. University of California Publications in Classical Philology 6. 1-318. November, 1919.

This book, says the author (iii), "falls into two distinct parts, a biography of Solon and an edition of the fragments of his poems". He should perhaps have said three parts, if the dictum attributed to Professor Kittredge is accepted, "Anyone can write a book; it takes a scholar to write an article", since Professor Linforth's well printed volume contains also nine Appendices. And, seeing that the edition is copiously annotated and accompanied by an opposite page translation into English, it puts into the hands of the Anglo-Saxon reader, whether he knows Greek or not, an easy means to form his own impression of the work and the ideas of the thoughtful poet whom Lord Acton calls "the most profound political genius of antiquity". That is a substantial service.

Professor Linforth arranges the fragments according to the epoch of the ancient authors through whose quotation of them they have reached us, including in each instance the accompanying comment, where any exists. This has the obvious drawback of disassociating parts of the same poem, while there is not much that is positive to commend it. It has the negative advantage, however, of enabling the editor to print the fragments on some principle, and with their non-Solonian context, without having to combine them

<sup>22</sup>For Horace's later rapprochement with Stoicism see Arnold, *Roman Stoicism*, 389.

<sup>23</sup>Compare Boissier, *Le Religion Romaine*, 1.221 ff. (1900). He gives a detailed and excellent treatment of the theology of Vergil. In the present article, I have, from limits of space, confined myself chiefly to the points directly raised by Professor Frank. On page 230, note 1, Boissier has some pertinent remarks directed against those who have tried to find in the Aeneid the traces of Epicureanism.

<sup>18</sup>Aeneis, Buch VI<sup>2</sup>, 348.

<sup>19</sup>The Classical Review 14 (1900), 153 f.

<sup>20</sup>Just as the entrance took place at dawn (255), and midday was reached at verses 535 f.

<sup>21</sup>Arnold, *Roman Stoicism*, 391, remarks that this last line sums up the whole ethics of Stoicism.

with one another in oftentimes dubious wholes. The text calls for little comment. One conjecture the editor himself offers—with commendable modesty—the substitution of *μαλῶνται* for the manuscript reading *μᾶ ὦν* in Frag. XL, 111. Seeing that Krates in his parody of the poem uses this word (*μαϊόμενος*) and that the manuscript reading does not make sense, Professor Linforth may be right. The out about it is that one does not see how such corruption of the original text as Professor Linforth's conjecture involves could have occurred, since a marginal gloss does not ordinarily yield us an unintelligible word. The translation runs smoothly enough and can be read with comprehension by one unacquainted with the language of the original. It does not have the supreme excellence of stylistic equivalence, but this, as Tacitus says of the mixed constitution, *laudari facilius quam evenire potest*.

Towards the literary sources of Solon's life and work Professor Linforth's attitude is that they have in fact little value when uncorroborated by Solon's own words. He, accordingly, shares the critical standpoint of Beloch and his school, and differs from them mainly in refraining from offering a theory of his own for the one he discards. Two quotations, from pages 4 and 6, show his attitude:

... We certainly cannot push back the possibility of a written record of any sort about Solon beyond the middle of the fifth century B. C. at the earliest; but Solon himself lived in the first half of the sixth century. . . . we can accept little besides what we know was learned from the poems and the official records.

Professor Linforth believes that there was a well recognized collection of poems by Solon in the first half of the fifth century B. C.; he holds that the life of Solon was known by the ancients and can be known by us only through his poems.

This postulated, the real difficulty in dealing with Solon is to determine how much of what the ancient tradition hands on to us is based upon poems lost in postclassical times, how much is based upon laws of Solon which were still known, though already in Aristotle's time they were no longer used, and how much is pure legend—stuff that belongs to the cycle of the Seven Wise Men and the constitutional controversies of Athens and the schools of philosophy. Professor Linforth makes his course safer by avoiding the shallows of probabilities, but in science, as in life, a resolute balancing of probabilities is always necessary.

Naturally the poems of Solon did not contain a draft of Solon's constitution: this he could assume that the Athenians to whom he addressed his verses knew from other sources. Inferences from Solon's own words, therefore, cannot in the nature of the case yield the plan of government he inaugurated—as Aristotle reveals to our sorrow. And the weakness of Aristotle's *Polity of the Athenians* is also a signal weakness of Professor Linforth's book. We have in

it no synthesis of Solon's constitutional work. Had Professor Linforth thought out more cogently the implications of the isolated facts we possess regarding the public law of Athens before and after Solon, he would perhaps have spared us his suggestion as to the means employed by Solon for <re> gaining Salamis. If the Athenian hoplites had failed in the war with Megara over the island, there is little likelihood that 500 men "of the lower classes", "little better than serfs", however great their inducements, would have changed the military balance. Such volunteers must have been worse than useless in a struggle against trained heavy-armed troops.

Of the nine Appendices the least satisfactory is Appendix 4—The Laws and the Axones. It should have started with the definitions reached by Wilhelm in his *Beiträge zur Griechischen Inschriftenkunde*, 229 ff., Über die Öffentliche Aufzeichnung von Urkunden, and should have taken account of the distinction between *νόμοι* and *ψηφίσματα*, drawn clearly e. g. by Francotte, *Mélanges de Droit Public Grec*, 1 ff. It is of some importance in this connection that the Athenian *ecclesia* at all times lacked legislative powers. The *νόμοι* were not so easily changed in the sixth and fifth centuries B. C. as Professor Linforth thinks. Professor Linforth does not indeed follow Beloch and De Sanctis in making Draco a serpent god: but he leaves to Draco the rôle of formulating laws regarding homicide alone, so that "it remained for Solon to draw up a genuine code and earn the name of father of Athenian laws (Plat. *Symp.* 209 d)".

That there is room for uncertainty here must be admitted. Aristotle, for example, in his first draft of the *Polity of the Athenians*, attributed to the thesmothetes the writing out and publishing of the laws. Draco was apparently overlooked and the code given to Solon. On interpolating his mass of misinformation about Draco, however, Aristotle made the latter the first legislator. It seems to me probable that, if Draco issued instructions for magistrates and other organs of government to guide them in handling cases of homicide, he issued instructions for them in other matters as well. He thus was the first to issue in written form a law code: the thesmothetes in earlier days had simply 'determined, for the guidance and control of the king, polemarch', and archon, the customs by which these magistrates rendered decisions. Solon recast the State by issuing laws "which", as he himself claimed, "showed equal consideration for the upper and lower classes, and provided a fair administration of justice for every individual" (so Professor Linforth translates the words of Solon).

Professor Linforth's book is a good honest scientific effort, vigorous in style and penetrating in analysis, that falls short of highest distinction through distrust of the constructive imagination and a certain impatience with finespun arguments.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

W. S. FERGUSON